

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

A supplemental information disclosure statement is filed herewith that includes all references cited in the specification that were not listed in the original information disclosure statement previously filed on July 20, 2004.

Several paragraphs of the specification are amended to correct certain informalities located by the Applicant in reviewing the specification and errors noted by the examiner. Specifically, the drawing objections cited by the examiner are corrected by deleting reference numbers from the specification that do not appear in the drawings and adding other reference numbers to the specification that appear in the drawings but were not mentioned in the specification. Therefore, the drawings and specification should now be in acceptable form.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6-20 are amended in the present amendment.

Claims 1, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17 and 19 are objected to because of certain informalities, including minor draft errors, grammatical errors and lack of antecedent basis problems. Claims 1, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17 and 19 are amended to correct these errors. Claims 1, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17 and 19 should now be in proper form for allowance.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 17 and 18 recite "the control panel." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this element. Claims 15-18 are amended to include the proper antecedent

basis. Claim 16 also recites “a control panel.” It is indefinite as to which control panel claims 17 and 18 are referring. Again, claims 15-18 are amended to more particularly define the control panel. Claims 19 and 20 include the indefinite phrase “may be.” Claims 19 and 20 are amended by replacing “may be” with “is.” Claims 17-20 should now be in proper form for allowance.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,404,854 to Carroll et al. The method of claim 12 is amended to include the step of “coupling a sensor driver and an image processor to the image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor and converting the analog output x-ray image to a digitally formatted x-ray image, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from the x-ray source.” The Carroll et al. reference does not teach or suggest coupling a sensor driver and an image processor to an image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor and converting the analog output x-ray image to a digitally formatted x-ray image, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from an x-ray source.

In addition, the examiner in describing the allowance of claims 1-11, states that the prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a system including a sensor driver and an image processor coupled to an image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from an x-ray source. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. The Applicant believes that amended claim 12 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,426,684 to Gaborski et al. Claim 13 is a dependent claim dependent upon independent claim 12, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements it contains.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al. and Gaborski et al. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,449 to Aragonés. Claim 14 is a dependent claim dependent upon independent claim 12, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements it contains.

Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al., Gaborski et al., Aragonés, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,798,958 to Hudson et al. The method of claim 15 is amended to include the step of “coupling a sensor driver and an image processor to the image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor and converting the analog output x-ray image to a digitally formatted x-ray image, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from the x-ray source.” The cited prior art reference does not teach or suggest coupling a sensor driver and an image processor to an image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor and converting the analog output x-ray image to a digitally formatted x-ray image, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from an x-ray source.

In addition, the examiner in describing the allowance of claims 1-11, states that the prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a system including a sensor driver and an image processor coupled to an image sensor for receiving an analog output x-ray image from the image sensor, wherein the image processor interfaces with a source control unit for receiving exposure settings from an x-ray source. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. The Applicant believes that amended claim 15 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 is a dependent claim dependent upon independent claim 15, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements it contains.

Claims 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al., Gaborski et al., Aragonese, and Hudson et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0015283 to Sallam. Claims 16, 17 and 20 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 15, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll et al., Gaborski et al., Aragonese, Hudson et al., and Sallam as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,712 to Tomasetti et al. Claim 18 is a dependent claim dependent upon independent claim 15, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements it contains.

The Applicant appreciates the examiner's allowance of claims 1-11.

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. No new matter has been added to the application. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned in the event a telephone conference would be helpful in advancing prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: 08/31/2005

By: William K. Baxter  
William K. Baxter  
Reg. No. 41,606

Attorneys of Record for Applicant  
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.  
780 North Water Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590  
Telephone: 414-273-3500  
Facsimile: 414-273-5198  
Email: wbaxter@gklaw.com

MW976023\_1.DOC